

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/597,704		VOOIS ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	KRISTIE D. SHINGLES		2444	

All Participants:

(1) KRISTIE D. SHINGLES, Examiner.

(2) Eric Curtin, Atty.

Date of Interview: 5 November 2009

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

35 USC 103(a)

Claims discussed:

1 and 2

Prior art documents discussed:

Shaffer et al (US 6,125,108)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Kristie D. Shingles/
Examiner, Art Unit 2444

Status of Application: Final Rejection

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 3:00pm

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: With Primary's approval, Examiner contacted Atty to suggest Examiner's Amendments to place the claims in condition for allowance. Examiner proposed integrating the limitations of claim 2 into each independent claim. Atty suggested integrating only a portion of claim 2's limitations into the independent claims, excluding the call announce feature. Examiner did not believe this would bring the claims into condition for allowance. Examiner notified Atty that the previous rejection would be maintained until a resolution of allowable matter is agreed upon. Examiner found that the teachings of Shaffer et al could still teach the newly amended portion of the claim 2, in that Shaffer et al's teaching of configuring IP devices also configures the server, since it is the server that employs the user's profile for enabling the selection of the configuration options. Hence, the server is configured to enable specific IP telephony services for the user and to communicate this services to the user's IP device (col.4 lines 1-28).